DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 595 HE 010 850

AUTHOR Gelso, Charles J.; And Others
TITLE A Multi-Group Evaluation of the Models and Functions of University Counseling Centers. Research Report No. 8-76.
INSTITUTION Maryland Univ., College Park. Counseling Center.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 29p.
AVAILABLE FROM Counseling Center, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742 ($1.50)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Personnel; Administrator Attitudes; College Faculty; College Students; Consultation Programs; *Counseling Programs; *Counseling Services; Counselor Attitudes; *Guidance Centers; Higher Education; Models; Occupational Guidance; *Participant Satisfaction; Program Evaluation; Psychotherapy; Resident Assistants; School Surveys; State Universities; Student Attitudes; Student Personnel Workers; Teacher Attitudes; *Universities

ABSTRACT

The appropriateness of four counseling center models (traditional, consultation, vocational guidance, psychotherapy) and 15 specific counseling center functions for universities with enrollments of 10,000 plus were evaluated by samples of counselors, student personnel administrators, resident assistants, faculty, students, and university administrators. Samples were drawn from a large public university in the East. The traditional model was evaluated most positively by five of the subgroups. The most salient findings were: (a) In both the models and functions phase of the study, student personnel subgroups rated consultation-related activities as appreciably more appropriate, both in a relative and absolute sense, than did non-student personnel subgroups; (b) While the psychotherapy model consistently received the lowest ratings, certain types of personal adjustment counseling received consistently positive ratings; (c) Educational-vocational counseling was seen as highly appropriate by all groups but counselors, and student personnel administrators did not feel enough of it was being done, which was consistent with earlier research. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED165595

COUNSELING CENTER

Office of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

College Park, Maryland

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Counseling Center
Univ of Md

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

A MULTI-GROUP EVALUATION OF THE MODELS AND FUNCTIONS OF UNIVERSITY COUNSELING CENTERS

Charles J. Celso, Janice M. Birk, Patrick W. Utz
and Anne E. Silver

Research Report # 8-76

HE 010 852

COUNSELING CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

A MULTI-GROUP EVALUATION OF THE MODELS AND FUNCTIONS OF UNIVERSITY COUNSELING CENTERS

Charles J. Gelso, Janice M. Birk, Patrick W. Utz and Anne E. Silver

Research Report # 8-76

Summary

The appropriateness of four counseling center models (traditional, consultation, vocational guidance, psychotherapy) and 15 specific counseling center functions for universities with enrollments of 10,000 plus were evaluated by samples of counselors, students personnel administrators, resident assistants, faculty, students, and university administrators. Samples were drawn from a large, public university in the East. The traditional model was evaluated most positively by five of the subgroups. The most salient findings were: (a) In both the models and functions phase of the study, student personnel subgroups rated consultation-related activities as appreciably more appropriate, both in a relative and absolute sense, than did non-student personnel subgroups; (b) While the psychotherapy model consistently received the lowest ratings, certain types of personal adjustment counseling received consistently positive ratings; (c) Educational-vocational counseling was seen as highly appropriate by all groups but counselors and student personnel administrators, consistent with earlier research, did not feel enough of it was being done.

A Multi-Group Evaluation of the Models and Functions of University Counseling Centers

The past decade has witnessed much ferment within counseling psychology regarding the roles and functions that are appropriate for counseling centers to assume. The flavor of much of the current literature on this topic suggests that if counseling centers are to flourish, or perhaps even survive, we must conceptualize new ways of doing business. The traditional model of the counselor sitting in an office helping individuals or small groups is no longer satisfactory (e.g., Oetting, Ivey & Weigel, 1970; Warnath, 1970, 1973). That literature also seems to imply that relevant campus groups other than counselors are disenchanted with traditional counseling operations, to the point that in a time of tight money counseling agencies in higher education fall into the category of endangered species.

Despite the ferment, there has been little if any attempt to assess the usefulness, appropriateness, etc., of the various roles that the college counselor may assume (e.g., vocational counselor, university consultant, psychotherapist, jack of all trades). Research on counselor role suggests that counselors and other campus groups (e.g., students, faculty) differ in their perceptions of the appropriateness of several functions. Counselors view their roles as more appropriately involved with personal counseling, while other groups view vocational and academic counseling as the more appropriate counselor role (Gelso, Karl, & O'Connell, 1972; Resnick & Gelso, 1971; Wilcove & Sharp, 1971). While these findings, first uncovered by Warman (1960, 1961), have been useful, there currently exists a serious need for data on functions more specific than these three general problem areas. Also, it would be useful to have information on perceptions held by various groups of the appropriateness of functions beyond the traditional, direct service ones examined in the Warman type research.

Along a similar vein, recent surveys of activities of counseling centers suggest that there exist several models or types of centers (Elton & Rose, 1973; Oetting et al., 1970). Some of the more common models are labeled by Oetting et al. the "Psychotherapy model," the "Vocational Guidance model," and the "Traditional model." A more futuristic model described by these researchers is the "Consultation model." Along with examining various subgroups' perceptions of the appropriateness of a variety of counseling center functions, the present study examined perceptions of the appropriateness of these four counseling center models. In a time of ferment as discussed above, we felt that an examination of the viewpoints of various groups regarding both the four models and a number of specific functions would be an important empirical starting point.

Specifically, the major purposes of the present study were to assess whether (a) professional counseling center staff and five additional subgroups (students, faculty, residence hall assistants, student personnel administrators, university administrators) differ in their perceptions of the appropriateness of the four counseling center models noted above; (b) these same six subgroups differentially evaluate the appropriateness of 15 specific functions, most of which are commonly conducted at university counseling centers (Anderson, 1970). Secondarily, this investigation sought to determine if ratings of the four models are contingent on whether a counseling center is the sole treatment agency on a campus, and if the six subgroups differed in an index of satisfaction with the activities engaged in by the actual counseling center of the university at which the study was conducted. These objectives were examined in three phases of analysis.

Method

Sample and Procedure

Samples were drawn from six relevant campus subgroups at a large public university in the East. The subgroups were (a) Counseling Center professional staff, (b) students, (c) faculty, (d) student personnel administrators, (e) univeristy administrators, and (f) residence hall assistants. The questionnaire (described in the next section) was completed anonymously by subjects during the 1974 Spring semester, except where noted below.

The instrument was completed by 28 of the 30 (93%) full-time Counseling Center professional staff within the three service divisions of the Center, i.e., Counseling Division, Reading and Study Skills Division, and Parent Consultation and Child Evaluation Division. The student subgroup was obtained by administering the instrument to all students (n = 187) who were present during a given class period in seven different sections of the university's introductory psychology course. Approximately half the students in that course were freshmen and one-third sophomores.

A list of 170 faculty members was randomly generated. Faculty were mailed the research instrument, along with a cover letter signed by the researchers and aimed at soliciting cooperation. Non-respondents were mailed a second copy three weeks later. These mailings elicited a return rate of only 40%. Thus, it was decided to continue efforts aimed at increasing faculty response during the following semester. Two additional mailings with personalized cover letters raised the return rate to 65% (n = 105 of 162; eight of the original 170 were not at the university during the time of data collection). Early vs. late returners (responders for first two vs. last two mailings) did not differ significantly in their familiarity with the activities of the Counseling Center

(on a 7 point Likert scale); nor did they differ beyond chance frequency on the 34 additional items on the instrument.

Residence hall assistants (RA's) were those student personnel workers, graduate and undergraduate, who were responsible for administration and coordination of activities in a given residence hall area, e.g., a floor, and who work directly with students in a "counseling-like" capacity. The instrument was mailed to all RA's, and three weeks later a second mailing was sent to nonrespondents. The second mailing was followed up by at least one phone call from the fourth author to nonresponders. These efforts resulted in a 66% return rate (n = 84 of 128). It should be noted that the return rate differed markedly for white vs. black RA's (74 of 99 or 75% for whites; 10 of 29 or 34% for blacks). Thus, findings should only be generalized to white RA's.

Student Personnel administrators were defined as people in the Office of Student Affairs who did not have direct contact with students as part of their primary job responsibilities. This group included all student personnel deans, directors, and the coordinators of residence hall areas (more than one hall per area). University administrators included top-level administrators (not in student affairs) such as the chancellor, vice chancellors, division chairpersons, and deans. Both subgroups were mailed the instrument and cover letter, and a second mailing was conducted three weeks later. Return rates were 80% (16 of 20) for the student personnel administrators and 75% (21 of 28) for the university administrators.

Instrumentation

The research questionnaire was organized into two parts. Part I asked subjects to rate the appropriateness (defined as usefulness to a campus) of four types of counseling centers in universities with enrollments larger than 10,000.

The four types, representing the four models noted above, were simply numbered on the questionnaire; actual labels were not indicated. Each model was rated on a 7-point Likert scale containing the following anchor points: 1 = not appropriate/useful, 4 = moderately appropriate/useful, 7 = highly appropriate/useful. Questionnaire instructions to Part I asked subjects to assume as they were reading the descriptions that each type had counselors who were well trained to perform the duties involved in each description.

To determine if ratings of the four models were contingent on whether the counseling center was the only mental health or psychological/educational services agency on campus, half the questionnaires asked subjects to make that assumption, and the remaining half did not. The descriptions on which subjects based their ratings are presented below. These were condensed from Oetting et al. (1970) which, in turn, were based on their large scale study of counseling centers in the United States. An effort was made by the researchers to describe the functions and advantages of each model objectively. Descriptions were presented in the order given below, as it was felt that order effects were highly implausible, and since a uniform order enhanced the ease with which the models could be described.

Vocational Guidance Model. This type center views its main function as providing counseling that helps students make decisions about what academic majors and/or vocations are suitable for them. Counseling entails giving the student vocational interest and aptitude tests and then having a few counseling sessions aimed at helping him/her make educational and/or vocational decisions. This type of center also provides help with reading and study skills problems and may also run extensive freshman orientation programs that provide vocational test interpretation and help in selecting a major. Students with personal/emotional problems requiring personal counseling or psychotherapy are referred to other agencies for treatment. The chief advantage of this type of center is that it provides counseling for a larger number of students in a very important area -- selection of a major and career planning.

5-point Likert scale as follows: 1 = highly appropriate, 2 = somewhat appropriate, 3 = neutral or undecided, 4 = somewhat inappropriate, 5 = highly inappropriate. These functions, noted in Table 2, were each briefly defined. Also in Part II subjects were asked to rate the extent to which they thought the counseling center of the university in which the study was conducted was involved in each function (1 = highly involved, 2 = moderately involved, 3 = slightly involved or uninvolved). The latter ratings were required so that an index of satisfaction with the Center's activities could be obtained.

Finally, the order of presentation of Parts I and II was counterbalanced. An analysis of the student subgroup indicated that order effects did not exist beyond chance frequency (cf. Sakoda, Cohen & Beall, 1954).

Results

Counseling Center Models

The questions we sought to answer in this phase of the analysis were (a) Do professional counseling center staff and the five additional campus groups differ in their perceptions of the appropriateness of the four counseling center models? and (2) Are ratings of the four models contingent on whether subjects make the assumption that a counseling center is the sole treatment agency on a campus? Two series of anlayses of variance were performed to answer these questions. First, 2 X 6 (Assumptions by Subgroups) ANOVA's for unequal n's were conducted for each model. Second, one-way, repeated measures ANOVA's were performed for each subgroup, comparing its ratings of the four models. (We sought to make each statistical analysis throughout the study as simple as possible, since the interpretation and appropriateness of complex factorial designs are problematic when cell sizes are highly disparate, as in our study.)

Psychotherapy Model. The major function of this type of center is to provide psychotherapy for students with emotional problems. While the therapy may last for only a few weekly sessions, it is often longer-term therapy, e.g., lasting up to and at times beyond a year in duration. Little or no vocational counseling/guidance is offered at this type of center. Vocational/educational problems are often seen as something students solve themselves, solve through interactions with faculty or residence hall advisers, or become capable of solving through psychotherapy. At some centers, students who want vocational counseling are referred for guidance to other agencies. Since psychotherapy often lasts several months, large numbers of students cannot be seen at this type of center. The chief advantage of this type is that it provides intensive and extensive treatment for the relatively small numbers of students who do receive therapy.

Traditional Model. The role of this type of center is to provide vocational counseling, short-term counseling for emotional problems, and some longer-term counseling. The center does not focus exclusively on either vocational guidance counseling (as does Type 1) or psychotherapy (as does Type 2). Yet it may provide both services to some extent. The approach of such a center to helping students with academic/vocational choice problems is not as oriented toward interpreting vocational interest and aptitude tests as is the approach in Type 1. It is more toward helping the student explore himself and, as a result, make sound choices. Therapy or personal counseling at such centers tends not to be as long term (extensive) as in the Type 2 center. The main advantage of this type of center is that it provides treatment for students with a wide variety of problems.

Consultation Model. The major functions or roles of the three types of centers just described involve providing direct service to students. That is, students work directly with counselors, individually or in groups, in an effort to solve their problems. The major function of the Type 4 center, however, is to work with those people on campus who themselves are most involved with students. For example, counselors consult with faculty members, residence hall counselors, deans, etc., in an effort to (a) help these people work more effectively with students, and (b) help organize the campus environment so that it fosters good mental health and educational development in students. In a sense, the Type 4 center aims at preventing serious student problems before they occur. When problems do occur, the counselors consult with those most directly involved in an attempt to help them (e.g., residence hall counselors, advisers, etc.) help the student. Counselors at this center do very little direct ("face-to-face") counseling with students. The main advantage of this type of center is that many more students, in the end, may be affected by the counselors' work with the people on campus who deal with students daily.

Part II of the questionnaire asked subjects to rate the appropriateness (defined as usefulness and importance) of 15 specific counseling center functions for a campus whose enrollment exceeded 10,000. Ratings were made on a

Table 1 presents means and SD's for each subgroup on each model. The F ratios for the main effects of Subgroups from the 2 X 6 ANOVA's are presented in the bottom row of the table. It can be seen that the subgroups differ significantly in their ratings of three of the four models. Post hoc testing with the Duncan Multiple Range Test indicated that students and faculty viewed the Vocational Guidance Model as significantly more appropriate than do RA's and counseling center staff. Conversely, the three student personnel subgroups (counseling center staff, RA's, student personnel administrators) rated the Consultation Model as significantly more appropriate than did the faculty and university administrators. The only subgroup differences on the Traditional Model were between the student personnel administrators and counseling staff; the administrators rated that model as less appropriate.[2]

Insert Table 1 About Here

None of the Subgroups X Assumptions interactions attained significance. The main effect for Assumptions on the Psychotherapy Model, however, was highly significant ($F = 4.94$, $p = .001$). While ratings of that model were low (below 4.0) for each subgroup, the model was perceived as somewhat more appropriate when the counseling center was the only mental health service agency on a campus ($\bar{X} = 3.76$ vs. 3.29).

The F ratios from the repeated measures ANOVA's appear in the right-hand column of Table 1. All F's are highly significant, indicating that each subgroup differed in its evaluations of the four models. Inspection of Table 1 reveals that the ranks of the means on the four models is identical for the three non-student personnel subgroups (students, faculty, university administrators), with the Traditional Model receiving the highest ratings, followed by

the Vocational Guidance, Consultation, and Psychotherapy Models. The ranked means of the three student personnel groups are similar, with a few exceptions. In contrast to the non-student personnel groups, the ratings of these three subgroups are all higher for the Consultation Model than the Vocational Guidance one. Second, student personnel administrators rate the Consultation Model slightly more favorably than the Traditional Model. In fact, post hoc comparisons (Duncan's Test) indicate that the Traditional Model is seen as significantly more appropriate than the Consultation Model by all subgroups -- except the student personnel administrators.

Space limitations do not permit a detailed presentation of all post hoc comparisons. Suffice it to say that nearly all comparisons either attained or approached significance. Notably, all subgroups gave significantly lower ratings to the Psychotherapy Model than any other model.

Evaluations of Specific Functions

In the second phase of the analysis, we attempted to determine if the six subgroups differentially evaluate the appropriateness of 15 specific functions performed by counseling centers. These functions are enumerated in Table 2. They are categorized into five general activity areas. Table 2 presents the mean ratings, within group rankings for each mean, and standard deviations for each subgroup on each function. One-way ANOVA's were calculated for each function to determine if the subgroups differed in their perceptions of the appropriateness of that function. The F ratio from these analyses are given in the right-hand column of Table 2.

Insert Table 2 About Here

It may be seen in Table 2 that the only function that is not differentially evaluated by the six subgroups is educational-vocational counseling. All subgroups rated this function quite positively, as indicated by both the mean ratings and the ranks for those means.

Table 2 also reveals the existence of a general pattern. University administrators and faculty members tend to view functions as less appropriate than do RA's and, even moresc, counselors. Post hoc analyses with the Duncan test indicated that nearly all of these differences obtained significance. The pattern is most pronounced within the Personal Adjustment Counseling Category. The two sets of subgroups differ from one another on all six functions. Ratings within the Vocational Counseling/Educational Skills category reveal a somewhat different pattern. As indicated, educational-vocational counseling does not differentiate the subgroups. For both reading instruction and study skills counseling/training, students as well as counselors make higher appropriateness ratings than faculty alone. Finally, students view tutoring activities as more appropriate than all other groups.

The pattern of differences in the Consultation category varied with the focal point of consultation. The three student personnel subgroups rated consultation with faculty, RA's, etc. (aimed at helping these people work more effectively with students) as more appropriate than did the non-student personnel groups. When the focal point was consultation with administrators (aimed at helping them better understand student needs and altering the environment to better meet those needs), however, students as well as RA's and counselors responded more positively than faculty and administrators. Notably, student personnel administrators' appropriateness ratings dropped for this item so that they no longer were more positive than ratings from faculty and university administrators.

Regarding the Research category, RA's and counselors viewed both research functions as more appropriate than did university administrators. With respect to student development research, these two student personnel groups were joined by students in rating such research as more appropriate than do both faculty and administrators. All three student personnel subgroups, however, rated counseling research more positively than did both students and administrators (but not faculty). Thus, relative to other subgroups, students feel that student development research is more appropriate than counseling research, while the converse appears true for faculty. Finally, both counselors and student personnel administrators rate the training of doctoral students (through supervision) as more appropriate than do the three non-student personnel subgroups.

With some expections, the above data on counseling functions indicate that the student personnel subgroups, especially RA's and counselors (and above all, counselors) possess a general tendency to evaluate counseling functions as more appropriate than do non-student personnel groups. It is important, however, to assess how each subgroup evaluates the 15 functions. Such an analysis reveals the relative appropriateness ascribed to particular functions, independent of a subgroup's response set. To accomplish this, we conducted for each subgroup a one-way repeated measures ANOVA (15 levels) and then performed the Duncan Test as a post hoc measure. The bottom row of Table 2 presents the F ratios for these repeated measures ANOVA's. The F's indicate that, for each subgroup, the 15 functions are rated differentially. Space limitations do not permit a presentation of the post hoc comparisons. Suffice it to say that, given the power of repeated measures statistics and the relatively large sample sizes, statistical significance was abundant, though not especially significant practically. Probably the general within-subgroup patterns, as revealed by our

ranking of the mean ratings (adjacent to the means in Table 2), are of greatest interest here. Those rankings reveal that the functions viewed quite positively by all subgroups are educational/vocational counseling, individual personal counseling, short-term counseling, counseling students with normal personal problems, and, to a lesser extent, study skills counseling/training. Functions whose appropriateness means yield uniformly low ranking are long-term counseling, counseling students with severe psychological problems, and tutoring. Low rankings for all subgroups also are obtained by functions such as reading instruction and consultation with administrators (except for the student group, which ranked the latter function 7th out of 15).

Several functions yield widely different appropriateness rankings across the subgroups. Means for "consultation with RA's, faculty, etc." yields ranks of either 2nd or 3rd by the student personnel subgroups but only 7th and 11th by faculty and students; counseling research obtains ranks of 3, 5 and 7 by faculty, student personnel administrators, and RA's respectively, while it is ranked only 13th by students; study skills counseling/training is ranked 2nd and 3rd by students and administrators and 11th by RA's; training doctoral students is ranked only 12th by students but appreciably higher by all other groups, especially counselors; finally, group counseling receives very high ranks from counselors and student personnel administrators, but obtains a ranking of 15 from university administrators.

Index of Satisfaction

The third phase of the investigation sought to determine if subgroups were differentially satisfied with the activities engaged in by the counseling center of the university at which the study occurred. As an index of satisfaction with the center's activities, we computed Product-Moment correlations of

subjects' appropriateness ratings on the 15 functions with their ratings of the extent to which they thought their university's Center was involved in each function. Table 3 presents these correlations by subgroups. The very large correlations for faculty and university administrators suggest that those two subgroups are satisfied with the Center's activities. Appropriateness-involvement ratings for students also are correlated highly. Notably, the lowest correlations are for the three student personnel subgroups. Examination of ranked means on involvement and appropriateness for the student personnel groups revealed the existence of one especially striking discrepancy -- all three groups yielded rankings that were much higher for appropriateness (between 2 and 3 for the three groups) than for involvement (between 11 and 14 for the three groups) on the function, consultation with faculty, RA's, etc. Also, counselors and student personnel administrators appeared to believe the Center should be more involved in educational/vocational counseling than it was (involvement ranks = 9 and 7, appropriateness ranks = 1 and 2 for the two groups respectively). Finally, the one major discrepancy for the student subgroup was for the function, consultation with administrators (appropriateness rank = 7, involvement rank = 15).

Insert Table 3 About Here

Discussion

It is important to keep in mind that all appropriateness ratings in our study were made for counseling centers at universities with enrollments of 10,000 or more. Since both counseling center models (Elton & Rose, 1973) and specific functions (Anderson, 1970) vary somewhat with institutional size, caution must be exercised in generalizing the results to smaller institutions.

Relatedly, we cannot be certain that judgments made by subgroups at one university are representative of the same subgroups at other institutions although, as Gelso, Karl and O'Connell (1972) have noted, the findings of problem appropriateness research have shown striking consistency across institutions — at least for fairly large to large public universities.

Regarding the models phase of the study, for all but one subgroup the traditional or "jack-of-all-trades" model is viewed as most appropriate/useful. The exceptions was the student personnel administration group, which viewed the consultation model ("avant-garde" model) as equally appropriate. Also, the three non-student personnel groups rated the vocational guidance model as second in appropriateness to the traditional model. Unlike the student personnel groups, the groups of faculty, students, and university administrators appear to judge the vocational guidance model as more appropriate than the consultation model.

Our findings regarding the appropriateness of specific functions seem to parallel those noted above in important ways. The between-group comparisons suggest that consultation functions are seen as much more appropriate by student personnel groups than non-student personnel groups in our sample. Additionally, within-group rankings indicated that the non-student personnel groups do not tend to see consultation as high priority (relative to other functions). Counselors, RA's and student personnel administrators in our study, apparently reflecting the Zeitgeist in counseling psychology (e.g., Warnath, 1973), view consultation as quite appropriate and useful -- and seem to feel that counselors, at least at the institution at which data were gathered, should be doing more of it than they are. While the accuracy of this conclusion is somewhat dependent on the type of consultation and the particular subgroup being

studied, it does appear to the extent that the views of our sample are generalizable, that a gap exists between counseling psychologists and other student personnel workers on the one hand, and other relevant campus groups on the other regarding the appropriateness of consultation-outreach activities for counseling centers. As the view that such activities are of central import is relatively recent in our field, it may well be that we are witnessing the kind of generation gap in the consultation-outreach area that Warman uncovered several years ago in the domain of personal adjustment counseling, i.e., when the central importance within the profession of that activity was a relatively recent thing. What the current generation gap suggests is that if counseling centers are to receive support from relevant campus groups for nontraditional services such as consultation, they will need to inform, perhaps sell, these groups on the utility of the new functions.

While the psychotherapy model of a counseling center was consistently evaluated as the least appropriate, even when the center was seen as the only mental health agency on campus, several personal counseling functions were viewed as quite appropriate by all groups. Individual counseling/therapy, short-term counseling/therapy, and counseling of students with normal personal problems were all evaluated as relatively appropriate functions. Counselors did rate these activities as more appropriate than did other groups, especially non-student personnel groups. Such ratings by counselors occurred for nearly all functions, however, suggesting that counselors, unsurprisingly, possess a more positive response set toward counseling functions than do other groups.

Activities within the personal adjustment category such as long-term counseling and counseling students with severe psychological problems received comparatively low appropriateness rating by all groups (university administrators

being especially negative here). In general, results in the personal adjustment category are consistent with the traditional emphasis in counseling psychology and counseling centers on work with relatively normal populations on comparatively short-term bases. Also, the fact that appropriateness ratings of all groups studied vary consistently for the different personal counseling functions raises serious questions about the meaning of research that has examined the appropriateness for counseling of such global problem areas as personal adjustment, vocational choice, and college routine (cf. Kohlan, 1976; Resnick & Gelso, 1971; Warman, 1960, 1961; Wilcove & Sharp, 1971). Our results indicate that, at least within the personal adjustment area, it is important to differentiate factors such as problem severity and duration of treatment.

Consistent with prior appropriateness research, educational-vocational counseling was viewed as highly appropriate by all subgroups; and it is the only function of which none of the student personnel groups made higher ratings than the non-student personnel groups. At the same time, counselors and student personnel administrators felt the counseling center of the university at which this study was conducted should be more involved in that function than it was. Is this discrepancy between appropriateness and involvement simply a local finding? In response, several years ago counseling psychologists were at once noting the centrality of vocational counseling to the specialty and lamenting its denigration by practitioners (e.g., Brayfield, 1961; Samler, 1964). Recent research indicates that doctoral training in counseling psychology does not focus much energy on vocational counseling and related activities (Schneider & Gelso, 1972). Additionally, Graff and McLean (1970) found that doctoral level counselors view vocational counseling as dull and routine; this activity is usually relegated to sub-doctoral counselors (see also Graff, Raque & Danish, 1974). Thus, it appears that everyone thinks vocational counseling is a "good

thing," something central to the specialty, and something we ought to be doing a lot of; at the same time, that function is not something practitioners are eager to do. Along a somewhat different vein, Kohlan (1975) has recently found that while vocational counseling is still viewed as highly appropriate for counseling centers at large universities, even its appropriateness ratings have dropped some in the eyes of counselors since Warman's (1961) research. The present findings, taken together with other recent research and position papers, suggest that the role of educational-vocational counseling and related activities in counseling psychology and counseling centers is badly in need of re-assessment.

References

Anderson, W. Services offered by college counseling centers. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 380-382.

Brayfield, A. H. Vocational counseling today. In E. G. Williamson (Ed.), Vocational counseling, a reappraisal in honor of Donald G. Patterson. Minnesota Studies in Student Personnel Work, No. 11. Minneapolis: University of Minnesata Press, 1961. pp. 22-58.

Elton, C. F. and Rose, H. A. The counseling center: A mirror of institutional size. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20, 176-180.

Gelso, C. J., Karl, N. J. and O'Connell, T. Perceptions of the role of a university counseling center. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1972, 13, 441-447.

Graff, R. and McLean, D. Evaluating educational-vocational counseling: A model for change. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1970, 48, 568-574.

Graff, R., Raque, D. and Danish, S. Vocational-educational counseling practices: A survey of university counseling centers. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 21, 579-580.

Kohlan, R. G. Problems appropriate for discussion in counseling centers: 15 years later. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 560-562.

Oetting, E. R., Ivey, A. E. and Weigel, R. G. The college and university counseling center. Student Personnel Series No. 11. Washington, D. C.: American College Personnel Association, 1970.

Resnick, H. and Gelso, C. J. Differential perceptions of counseling role: A re-examination. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18, 549-554.

Samler, J. Where do counseling psychologists work? What do they do? What should they do? In A. S. Thompson and D. E. Super (Eds.), The professional preparation of counseling psychologists. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964, pp. 43-68.

Sakoda, J. M., Cohen, B. H. and Beall, G. Test of significance for a series of statistical tests. Psychological Bulletin, 1954, 51, 172-175.

Schneider, L. and Gelso, C. J. Vocational versus personal emphases in counseling psychology training programs. The Counseling Psychologist, 1972, 3, 90-93.

Warman, R. E. Differential perceptions of counseling role. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1960, 7, 269-274.

Warman, R. E. The counseling role of college and university counseling centers. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1961, 8, 231-238.

Warnath, C. F. New directions for college counselors. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Warnath, C. F. New myths and old realities, college counseling in transition. Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Wilcove, G. and Sharp, W. G. Differential perceptions of a college counseling center. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18, 60-63.

Footnotes

[2] For the sake of brevity, p values for the a posteriori analyses are not reported specifically. Any difference noted in the paper, however, did obtain a p value of .05 or less. Copies of tables presenting each comparison along with its p value are available gratis from the first author. Also, since the large number of comparisons increased the likelihood of Type I errors, alpha was set at .01 for all F ratios in the study. When post hoc comparisons were conducted following significant F's, however, alpha was set at .05 for the post hoc analyses.

Table 1

Perceptions of Appropriateness of Four Counseling Center Models

	Counseling Center Model								
	Vocational Guidance		Psychotherapy		Traditional		Consultation		Between Models
Subgroup	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	F's
Students (n = 187)	5.13	1.53	3.79	1.56	5.54	1.38	4.66	1.50	46.9*
Faculty (n = 105)	4.79	1.70	3.39	1.81	5.48	1.65	4.38	1.84	25.4*
Counseling Center (n = 28)	4.28	1.56	2.83	1.58	6.17	.89	5.24	1.24	34.8*
RA's (n = 84)	3.98	1.65	3.50	1.74	6.08	1.18	5.33	1.78	49.9*
Student Personnel Administrators (n = 16)	4.42	1.88	3.83	1.70	5.42	1.24	5.54	1.61	3.7*
University Administrators (n = 21)	4.71	1.42	3.10	1.51	5.43	1.60	4.00	1.64	9.1*
All Subgroups (n = 441)	4.73	1.66	3.54	1.68	5.67	1.41	4.76	1.68	
Between Subgroup F's	6.28*		2.49		2.92*		4.94*		

Note: * = $p < .01$; rating scale: 7 = highly appropriate/useful, 4 = moderately appropriate/useful, 1 = not appropriate/useful.

Table 2

Ratings of the Appropriateness of 15 Counseling Center Functions

Category & Function	Students $\bar{X}$ (rank)	SD	Faculty $\bar{X}$ (rank)	SD	Counselors $\bar{X}$ (rank)	SD	RA's $\bar{X}$ (rank)	SD	Student Persnl. Administration $\bar{X}$ (rank)	SD	University Administrat. $\bar{X}$ (rank)	SD	Between Group F's
Personal Adjustmt. Csl g.													
Individual Personal Csing./therapy	1.48(2)	.75	1.74(2)	1.06	1.17(2)	.38	1.19(1)	.50	1.23(1)	.60	1.86(4)	1.06	6.61*
Short-term Csing./th. (to 12 sess.)	1.68(4)	.75	1.94(5)	1.21	1.10(1)	.31	1.21(2)	.52	1.46(8)	.78	1.91(5)	.94	9.82*
Long-Term Csing./th. (yr. or more)	2.43(14)	1.13	2.83(13)	1.42	2.27(13)	1.02	2.46(13)	1.28	2.85(13)	.99	4.00(14)	1.14	7.63*
Group Th./Csing.	1.83(8)	.96	1.96(6)	1.13	1.17(2)	.46	1.40(5)	.72	1.31(3)	.48	2.19(10)	1.12	7.43*
Csing./th. students with severe Psych. problems	2.45(15)	1.47	3.27(15)	1.53	2.43(14)	1.41	2.84(14)	1.50	3.23(15)	1.36	4.33(15)	.97	9.32*
Csing./th. students with normal P-S problems	1.71(5)	.82	1.81(4)	1.08	1.20(7)	.49	1.35(4)	.64	1.39)	.87	1.71(3)	.96	4.86*
Vocational Csing. & Ed. Skills Work													
Ed-Voc Csing.	1.26(1)	.61	1.55(1)	1.02	1.17(2)	.59	1.43(6)	.81	1.23(1)	.44	1.62(1)	.97	2.84
Study-Skills Csing./ training	1.58(3)	.85	1.99(9)	1.16	1.30(8)	.70	1.69(11)	.90	1.69(9)	1.11	1.67(2)	.73	3.62*
Reading Instruction	1.89 (9)	.95	2.44(12)	1.32	1.57(12)	.90	2.07(12)	1.19	2.08(12)	1.04	2.00(8)	.89	4.47*
Tutoring (for spec. course)	1.90(10)	1.17	3.05(14)	1.46	2.60(15)	1.40	3.03(15)	1.48	3.15(14)	1.07	3.33(13)	1.59	14.95*

Table 2 (continued)

1. Consultation													
Cons. with RA's, Faculty, etc.	1.91(11)	.84	1.97(7)	1.13	1.17(2)	.38	1.28(3)	.55	1.31(3)	.48	1.91(5)	1.00	11.22*
Cons. with admin-	1.80(7)	.94	2.17(11)	1.25	1.33(9)	.55	1.63(10)	.93	1.92(11)	.76	2.33(12)	1.02	5.56*
Research													
Csing. Research	2.03(13)	.98	1.80(3)	1.04	1.40(10)	.56	1.46(7)	.61	1.39(5)	.65	2.14(9)	1.15	6.77*
Student development research	1.74(6)	.84	2.09(10)	1.12	1.40(10)	.50	1.57(8)	.91	1.77(10)	.93	2.19(10)	1.21	4.93*
Training													
Supervision of doctoral students	2.01(12)	.89	1.98(8)	1.23	1.17(2)	.38	1.59(9)	.88	1.39(5)	.51	1.95(7)	.99	6.22*
Between Function F's	24.4*		21.0*		15.8*		35.5*		10.0*		15.3*		

Note: * = $p < .01$; Abbreviations: Csing = Counseling, Psychol. = Psychological, P-S = Personal-social, Ed-Voc = Educational-Vocational, Cons. = Consultation, th = therapy, Rating scale: 1 = highly appropriate, 2 = somewhat appropriate, 3 = neutral undecided, 4 = somewhat inappropriate, 5 = highly inappropriate.

Table 3

Correlations of Appropriateness Ratings

With Involvement Ratings

Subgroup	r^a
Students	.74
Faculty	.91
University Admin.	.82
Student Personnel Admin.	.59
RA's	.52
Counselors	.51

[a]All r's = $p < .01$, except for the student personnel administration subgroup, for which $p = < .05$.